



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

T

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/792,362	03/03/2004	Constantine Georgiades	PC25104-03-DCL	4243
<div>7590 01/14/2008 Warner-Lambert Company LLC 201 Tabor Road Morris Plains, NJ 07950</div>				
			EXAMINER GHALI, ISIS A D	
			ART UNIT 1611	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/14/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/792,362	GEORGIADIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Isis A. Ghali	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9 and 16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/26/2004; 11/08/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The receipt is acknowledged of applicants' election filed 10/16/2007; IDS filed 11/08/2007; and IDS filed 11/26/2004.

Claims 1-16 are pending.

Response to Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of invention II, claims 10-15, and species insoluble particulate, whiting agent, and hydrogen peroxide in the reply filed on 10/16/2007 is acknowledged. Species of the insoluble polymer, insoluble particulate and plasticizers, do not apply on the elected invention II. The traversal is on the ground(s) that classification made by the examiner is not correct, and both inventions are classified in the same class and subclass, and no serious burden on the examiner to search both inventions. This is not found persuasive because the search system and the focus of the invention are completely different, requiring an undue burden on the patent examiner. While searches may seem to be overlapping, however extensive since the patent examiner searches the databases mostly literally. Rarely do applicants present claims to an inventions where the distinctness of the invention are readily clear such as a chemical compound and a gene sequence. It is the responsibility of the examiner to enforce 35 USC 101, which allows the applicant to obtain a patent for a

Art Unit: 1615

single invention. In the opinion of the examiner applicants present two distinct inventions because invention I is an intermediate product that is deemed to be useful as teeth whitening composition that can be incorporated in toothpaste, and does not need to be incorporated in multi-layer laminate as required by invention II and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Additionally, the multi-layered film of invention II does not require specific insoluble polymer or specific insoluble particulate as required by the composition of invention I.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 1-9 and 16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 10/16/2007.

Claims 10-15 are included in the prosecution.

Double Patenting

3. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

4. Claims 1-16 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-16 of copending Application No. 11/030,846. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of copending Application No. 11/086,517. Although the conflicting claims are not identical,

Art Unit: 1615

they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending applications and would be covered by any patent granted on the copending applications since the referenced copending applications and the instant application are claiming common subject matter as follows: the present claims and the conflicting claims of the copending application are directed to composition comprising water insoluble polymer, disintegration facilitator and active agent including whiting agent including hydrogen peroxide, and multi-layered laminate wherein at least one layer comprises said composition.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. Claims 1-16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 11/821,157. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending applications and would be covered by any patent granted on the copending applications since the referenced copending applications and the instant application are claiming common subject matter as follows: the present claims and the conflicting claims of the copending application are directed to composition comprising water insoluble polymer, disintegration facilitator and active agent including whiting agent including hydrogen

peroxide, and multi-layered device wherein at least one layer comprises said composition.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

8. Claims 1-16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 11/821,217. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending applications and would be covered by any patent granted on the copending applications since the referenced copending applications and the instant application are claiming common subject matter as follows: the present claims and the conflicting claims of the copending application are directed to composition comprising water insoluble polymer, disintegration facilitator and active agent including whiting agent including hydrogen peroxide, and multi-layered laminate wherein at least one layer comprises said composition.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

Art Unit: 1615

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2003/0152528 ('528).

US '528 disclosed oral dressing comprising backing member and layer comprising composition comprising water insoluble polymer, filler with colloidal silica is the preferred filler, tooth whitening agent with hydrogen peroxide is the preferred whitening agent (abstract; paragraphs: 0023, 0025-0029, 0054, 0800, 0107).

11. Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2004/0105834 ('834).

US '834 disclosed oral dressing comprising backing member and layer comprising composition comprising water insoluble polymer, filler with colloidal silica is the preferred filler, tooth whitening agent with hydrogen peroxide is the preferred whitening agent (abstract; paragraphs: 0023, 0025-0029, 0064, 0100, 0127).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isis A. Ghali whose telephone number is (571) 272-0595. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Isis A Ghali
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1615

IG



ISIS GHALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER